1	wo	
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
8		
9	Sebastian Craynon,) No. CV 11-8081-PCT-JAT
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER
11	VS.	
12	CitiMortgage, Inc.,	
13	Defendant.	
14	Defendant.	
15		_/
16	Pending before this Court is Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis.	
17	Before ruling on this request, the Court has twice required Plaintiff to amend his complaint	
18	to allege federal subject matter jurisdiction. In response to this Court's orders, on September	
19	7, 2011, Plaintiff filed another amended complaint.	
20	In this amended complaint, Plaintiff again alleges diversity jurisdiction and federal	
21	question jurisdiction. Taking diversity first, Plaintiff fails to allege a citizenship for himself,	
22	and fails to allege Defendant CitiMortgage Inc.'s principal place of business. See Hertz	

In this amended complaint, Plaintiff again alleges diversity jurisdiction and federal question jurisdiction. Taking diversity first, Plaintiff fails to allege a citizenship for himself, and fails to allege Defendant CitiMortgage Inc.'s principal place of business. *See Hertz Corp. v. Friend*, 130 S. Ct. 1181, 1192; - - - U.S. - - - (2010). Plaintiff further fails to allege any amount in controversy. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332. This is inadequate to allege diversity jurisdiction. Thus, despite the fact that subject matter jurisdiction premised on diversity might be possible, having given Plaintiff two prior opportunities to amend, and Plaintiff still failing to plead jurisdiction, the Court will not further advise Plaintiff how to plead his case.

Next, the Court will consider federal question jurisdiction. Plaintiff brings a cause of

action for quiet title, which is a state law claim. Plaintiff cites several federal statutes that he claims support his quiet title claim (Plaintiff never mentions to what he is seeking to quiet title). Because Plaintiff at least attempts to premise his quiet title claim on Defendant's alleged violation of federal law, and construing Plaintiff's amended complaint extremely liberally, the Court finds Plaintiff has at least attempted to bring a claim under federal law. This finding is without prejudice to Defendant raising any jurisdictional issues it deems appropriate.

As a result of the Court finding jurisdiction has been pleaded,

IT IS ORDERED granting Plaintiff's motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Doc. 2) without prepayment of costs or fees or the necessity of giving security therefor. Service by waiver or of the summons and complaint shall be at government expense on the Defendant by the U.S. Marshal or his authorized representative. Plaintiff shall complete and return all necessary documents to effect service to the Clerk's office (to forward to the Marshal) within 30 days of the date of this Order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment (Doc. 10) is denied, without prejudice.

DATED this 11th day of October, 2011.

James A. Teilborg / United States District Judge